



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

	and the second s			
APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/989,161	11/21/2001	Masashi Aonuma	Q66561	9563
SUGHRUF M	7590 06/26/2007 ION ZINN MACPEAK	EXAMINER .		
SUGHRUE, MION, ZINN, MACPEAK & SEAS, PLLC 2100 Pennsylvania Avenue, N.W.			VAN HANDEL, MICHAEL P	
Washington, DC 20037-3202			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
		•	2623	
•				
			MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
	•		06/26/2007	PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Advisory Action Before the Filing of an Appeal Brief

Application No.		Applicant(s)		
	09/989,161	AONUMA, MASASHI		
	Examiner	Art Unit		
	Michael Van Handel	2623		

	Michael Van Handel	2623	
The MAILING DATE of this communication appear	ars on the cover sheet with the	correspondence add	ress
THE REPLY FILED <u>08 June 2007</u> FAILS TO PLACE THIS APP			
1. The reply was filed after a final rejection, but prior to or on this application, applicant must timely file one of the follow places the application in condition for allowance; (2) a Not a Request for Continued Examination (RCE) in compliance time periods:	the same day as filing a Notice or ing replies: (1) an amendment, a tice of Appeal (with appeal fee) in	of Appeal. To avoid aba offidavit, or other evider or compliance with 37 C	nce, which FR 41.31; or (3)
a) The period for reply expires 4 months from the mailing date			
b) The period for reply expires on: (1) the mailing date of this A no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire la Examiner Note: If box 1 is checked, check either box (a) or (iter than SIX MONTHS from the mail	ing date of the final rejecti	on.
TWO MONTHS OF THE FINAL REJECTION. See MPEP 70	06.07(f).		
Extensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(a). The date have been filed is the date for purposes of determining the period of extunder 37 CFR 1.17(a) is calculated from: (1) the expiration date of the set forth in (b) above, if checked. Any reply received by the Office later may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b). NOTICE OF APPEAL	ension and the corresponding amour hortened statutory period for reply or than three months after the mailing of	nt of the fee. The appropr iginally set in the final Offi	iate extension fee ce action; or (2) as
 The Notice of Appeal was filed on A brief in comp filing the Notice of Appeal (37 CFR 41.37(a)), or any exter 	liance with 37 CFR 41.37 must b	e filed within two montl	ns of the date of
a Notice of Appeal has been filed, any reply must be filed	within the time period set forth in	37 CFR 41.37(a).	ie appeai. Silice
AMENDMENTS			
 The proposed amendment(s) filed after a final rejection, I (a) ∑ They raise new issues that would require further cor 	nsideration and/or search (see N		ecause
(b) They raise the issue of new matter (see NOTE below		1	Ala - : fan
(c) ☐ They are not deemed to place the application in bet appeal; and/or			the issues for
(d) They present additional claims without canceling a	corresponding number of finally r	ejected claims.	
NOTE: See Continuation Sheet. (See 37 CFR 1.1)			
4. The amendments are not in compliance with 37 CFR 1.12	21. See attached Notice of Non-0	Compliant Amendment	(PTOL-324).
Applicant's reply has overcome the following rejection(s)			
 Newly proposed or amended claim(s) would be all non-allowable claim(s). 	•	•	
7. For purposes of appeal, the proposed amendment(s): a) how the new or amended claims would be rejected is provided that the status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follows: Claim(s) allowed:	☑ will not be entered, or b) ☐ \ vided below or appended.	will be entered and an o	explanation of
Claim(s) objected to:			
Claim(s) rejected: <u>1-12</u> .	•	•	
Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration:			
AFFIDAVIT OR OTHER EVIDENCE			
8. The affidavit or other evidence filed after a final action, bu because applicant failed to provide a showing of good and was not earlier presented. See 37 CFR 1.116(e).	t before or on the date of filing a d sufficient reasons why the affid	Notice of Appeal will <u>not</u> avit or other evidence i	ot be entered s necessary and
9. The affidavit or other evidence filed after the date of filing entered because the affidavit or other evidence failed to o showing a good and sufficient reasons why it is necessary	vercome all rejections under app	eal and/or appellant fa	ils to provide a
10. ☐ The affidavit or other evidence is entered. An explanation REQUEST FOR RECONSIDERATION/OTHER			
The request for reconsideration has been considered bu See Continuation Sheet.	t does NOT place the application	in condition for allowa	nce because:
12. Note the attached Information Disclosure Statement(s).	(PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)		
13.		1461	
		SCOTT E BELIVE	AU
·	PR	IMARY PATENT EXA	MIIIAELI

U.S. Patent and Trademark Office PTOL-303 (Rev. 08-06)

Application No.

Continuation Sheet (PTO-303)

Continuation of 3. NOTE: The amendment does not place the application in better form for appeal, because claims 1 and 11 recite the same limitations as claims 10 and 11 in the previous rejection. Amending claim 1 to include the features of dependent claim 10 further adds new limitations to dependent claims 2-4, 9, and 12, which would require further reconsideration and/or search.

Regarding claim 1, the applicant argues that available bandwidth of a network is a function of occupancy of the network, but not the data transfer rate of the network. The examiner respectfully disagrees. The USB Specification states that the bandwidth taken up by bulk data in a bulk data transfer can be whatever is available and not being used for other transfer types (4.7.2). That is, if more bandwidth is available (the network has a higher available transfer rate), more bulk data can be transferred in a given time. In an extreme, case, if other transfer types are taking up all of the bandwidth, zero bandwidth would be available and the bandwidth taken up by bulk data would be zero.

Regarding claim 11, the applicant argues that retransmission originates from the host controller side, and not the side of the transaction including the buffer memory. The examiner notes; however, the USB specification states that hardware handling includes retry of failed transfers. Since the data is being transferred from the buffer of the client to the host, the examiner maintains that the data will be retransmitted from the buffer in the event of an error (4.5.1 & 4.5.2).